

21104
Your
Seattle
City Light

Memorandum



DATE : April 28, 1980
TO : Fred Mandapat
FROM : Joe Recchi J. P. Recchi
SUBJECT: PCB Disposal

Thanks, Fred, for your report of April 17, 1980, on PCB disposal alternatives. I concur with your recommendation that we await further clarification and/or definition of EPA regulations related to packaging of capacitors for disposal. In this regard, then, I have some questions on which I would appreciate your response.

1. What is our capacity for interim storage/accumulation of PCB-contaminated apparatus?
2. What is our present accumulation in our storage facility of PCB-contaminated equipment?
3. Has Wes Con license been renewed by EPA as a certified disposal site?
4. Can Chem Nuclear accept non-leaking capacitors without the new packaging?
5. What is your recommendation for the timing, transport method, and disposal site for the next quantity of PCB-contaminated equipment?

I would appreciate your recommendations and responses to the above questions by May 9, 1980.

JPR:mbm

cc: Coe
Hunich
Rockey
Sickler
Willing
Peha
Riley
Recchi
File



DATE : April 17, 1980
TO : Joe Recchi
FROM : Fred Mandapat *AA*
SUBJECT : PCBs Disposal

In response to your memo of January 22, 1980, subject: "PCBs Disposal Contract", the following is a current status report and our comments.

A disposal contract with Chem Nuclear - No significant change. Purchasing is experiencing difficulty obtaining an annual contract. Chem Nuclear is highly reluctant to enter into an annual contract because they claim that disposal costs are changing too rapidly. Reason: The Federal and State Regulations are changing almost monthly.

Comment: Until the EPA approves an incineration plant, Chem Nuclear and Wes Con appear to be our only viable disposal facilities. Wes Con is presently shut down until EPA renews their license. Our latest word is that this should take about two weeks. Chem Nuclear is way overpriced, in my opinion for merely storage for now and later transport to the approved incineration facility. I therefore, propose to wait and see what Wes Con can offer under their revised license.

*are?
OK!!*

Cost to utilize a common carrier to haul our PCBs waste to the disposal site.

Purchasing obtained informal estimates from two large common carriers. An analysis based on our last disposal trip shows that we can still haul our own to either site for about two-thirds the cost. In dollars, we are looking at roughly the following per trip.

	Chem Nuclear <u>Arlington, Oregon</u>	Wes Con <u>Murphy, Idaho</u>
Common Carrier:	\$1,218	\$2,436
City Light Crew:	<u>\$ 800</u>	<u>\$1,600</u>
Difference	\$ 418	\$ 836

In view of the latest EPA regulations which will require us to package all capacitors in absorbant and steel drums if they will be disposed of in chemical landfills, I propose we continue to wait as long as we can

*OR /
what's our present annual disposal
responsibility?*

J. P. Recchi
Page 2
April 17, 1980

If Chem Nuclear can accept non-leaking capacitors without the new packaging, it may be to our advantage to send our capacitors there and pay the higher disposal charge. Leaking capacitors and sludge will now cost more even when disposed of at Wes Con.

AAM:cm

cc: Mandapat/D. Young
P. Willing/Riley
T. Flaherty
Kennedy
Central File
File

CTY0069654

SEA316067